

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,242	11/19/2003	lmtiaz Zafar	DP-309090	6879	•
22851 DELPHI TECH	7590 07/02/2007 NOLOGIES, INC.	•	EXAM	IINER	•
M/C 480-410-202		·	GESESSE, TILAHUN		
PO BOX 5052 TROY, MI 480			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2618		•
		•	,		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/02/2007	PAPER .	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

á

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/717,242	ZAFAR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Tilahun B. Gesessse	2618		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tilahun B. Gesessse	2618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or this application, applicant must timely file one of the foll places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a f a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complia time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, af Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in Ince with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing do b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) of TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPER	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lamay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704 NOTICE OF APPEAL	te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. extension and the corresponding amount e shortened statutory period for reply orig ter than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in corfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exa Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further 			ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be		TE Delow),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bappeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	.121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is p The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	but before or on the date of filing a N and sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filir entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess 	o overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ary and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanat REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered see attached.		n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s13. ☐ Other:). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
		Tilahun B Gesesss Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2618	e

Applicant's arguments filed May 30,2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page of sepc. Paragraph 0004, discloses that the prior art "the stationary satellite digital audio radio 1 does not supply the subscriber with local content (i.e, a region-wide broadcast signal) offered on AM/FM frequencies."

Improved stationary satellite digital audio radio that offers national and local programs content (such as AM/FM radio head unit and satellite head unit that AM/FM radio to cover the broadcast content locally and satellite (SDARS) radio unit to cover the nation-wide) broadcast contents.

Petros et al (us 6,806,838) as taught anticipates applicant's invention, petros teaches AM/FM tuner and satellite receiver integrated that enables the user to receiver local and nation-wide broadcast content.

On page 6 fourth paragraph of response to final rejection, applicant argued that Petros does not teach a stationary integrated head unit positioned on the surface includes an AM/FM terrestrial receiver/tuner human interface and a satellite receiver/tuner human interface.

The examiner disagrees. Petros teaches a stationary integrated head unit (see figures 3 and 8) positioned on the surface (mounted on surface 318 of figure 3) includes an AM/FM terrestrial receiver/tuner human interface (316 of figure 3) and a satellite receiver/tuner human interface (314 of figure 3) audio cable 330 and combined with head unit (320 of figure 3) see column 3, lines 42-column 4, lines 1-19 and column 5, lines 42-65 and figure 8)

On page 7, second paragraph of response admits that Petros teach SDARS/RX satellite receiver (item #314 and head unit (item #320 of figure 3) combined.

Besides, the limitation which applicant argues recites "a staionary integrated head unit position on the surface" in this case then, Petros teaches a stationary integrated head unit position on the surface, (see figures 3 and 8) in which the head units (SDARS and AM/FM are integrally connected) as recited in the claim invention.

On page 8, first paragraph of response, applicant argued that Petros does not teach a satellite low noise amplifier wherein the output of the low noise Amplifier (LNA) is the SDARS/SAT/TER cable.

The examiner disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a satellite low noise amplifier wherein the output of the low noise Amplifier (LNA) is the SDARS/SAT/TER cable) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim 12, as recited "a satellite low noise amplifier with a first input connected to the first end of satellite output, wherein the output of the low noise amplifier is

. SDARS/SAT/TER cable. In regard, Petros teaches a satellite low noise amplifier with a first input connected to the first end of satellite output (LNA 326) the first input (312 and 316) is connected the first end of satellite output (SDARS/RX (314) wherein the output

Application/Control Number: 10/717,242 Page 4

Art Unit: 2618

of the LNA (326) is SDARS/SAT/TER cable (312,316 and 322 of figure 3) see column 3, lines 42-column 4, lines 1-19 and column 5, lines 42-65 and figure 8)

To conclude, the applied prior art in view of applicant argument to the final rejection, has been thoroughly considered, however, applicant's argument is not persuasive, therefore, the final rejection is proper and maintained.

Tilahun Gesesse

June 23, 2007

TILAHUN GESESSE PRIMARY EXAMINER